

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendment and remarks herewith. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-25 are currently pending. Claims 1, 11-13, and 21-25, which are independent, are hereby amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification, specifically at paragraph [0068].

No new matter has been introduced. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101 AND §103(a)

Claims 11, 21, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,585,838 to Lawler, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Lawler") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,790,198 to Roop, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Roop") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,935,004 to Tarr et al. (hereinafter, merely "Tarr").

III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

A. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 11, 21, and 24 are amended, thereby obviating the rejections.

B. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“wherein when the first information of a predetermined program is changed, only the first information of the predetermined program is retransmitted from the first medium for updating the electronic program guide.”

(Emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that Lawler, Roop, and Tarr, taken either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or teach the above-identified features of claim 1. Specifically, nothing is found that discloses or teaches wherein when the first information of a predetermined program is changed, only the first information of the predetermined program is retransmitted from the first medium for updating the electronic program guide, as recited in claim 1.

Indeed, claim 1 recites that only the first information of a program is retransmitted when the first information of the program is change. None of the references relied by the Office Action discloses or teaches the above-identified features of claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable.

For at least similar or somewhat similar to the above reasons discussed with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 11-13 and 21-25 are also patentable.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Similarly, because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.


CONCLUSION

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800